



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,450	01/13/2004	Igor Garrievich Muttik	03.047.01	1086

7590
Zilka-Kotab, PC
P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120

EXAMINER

LANIER, BENJAMIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2432

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/755,450	Applicant(s) MUTTIK, IGOR GARRIEVICH	
	Examiner BENJAMIN E. LANIER	Art Unit 2432	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-13,15-18,20-30,32-35,37-47,49-52 and 55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-13, 15-18, 20-30, 32-35, 37-47, 49-52, 55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed 17 October 2008 amends claims 1, 18, 35, and 52. Claims 53-54 have been cancelled. Claim 55 has been added. Applicant's amendment has been fully considered and entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant argues, "applicant notes that the term 'tangible computer readable medium' is to read according to the plain and ordinary meaning thereof, in view of dictionary definitions, and in further view of the definitions provided in the Specification." In response, the Examiner would like to point out that the specification contains no definition of "computer readable medium". The phrase "computer readable medium," is not found to have proper antecedent basis in the specification, however it is necessary to use this terminology in order to properly define the claim within the boundaries of statutory subject matter, because the phrase "computer readable medium," appears to only reasonably convey hardware storage and forms of portable, physical article media to one of ordinary skill in the art. In order to overcome the objection, an amendment to the specification is necessary constituting a non-exhaustive statement of what the phrase "computer readable medium" would be as it would have been known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in order to verify that the term "computer readable medium," could not be taken in the context of non-statutory subject matter.

3. Applicant argues, "applicant respectfully asserted that the association is stronger than it would be without the modification of the set of rules...which is clearly definite." This argument is not persuasive because the term "more strongly associated" is not defined by the claim, the

Art Unit: 2432

specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to van der Made have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The phrase "computer readable medium," is not found to have proper antecedent basis in the specification, however it is necessary to use this terminology in order to properly define the claim within the boundaries of statutory subject matter, because the phrase "computer readable medium," appears to only reasonably convey hardware storage and forms of portable, physical article media to one of ordinary skill in the art. In order to overcome the objection, an amendment to the specification is necessary constituting a non-exhaustive statement of what the phrase "computer readable medium" would be as it would have been known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in order to verify that the term "computer readable medium," could not be taken in the context of non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2432

7. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, 20-30, 32-35, 37-47, 49-52, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not disclose how to detect whether the modified set of rules decreases malicious network traffic or slows malware propagation. Furthermore, it is unclear how modified rules in one particular system has any effect on the amount of malicious traffic or the amount of propagated malware.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, 20-30, 32-35, 37-47, 49-52, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. The term "more strongly associated" in claims 1, 18, and 35 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "more strongly associated" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

11. Additionally, it is unclear how modifying "said set of rules" has any effect on a set of program calls that has already been logged, or the amount of malicious network traffic and malware propagation.

12. The term "higher-level" in claim 55 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term " higher-level " is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a

Art Unit: 2432

standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN E. LANIER whose telephone number is (571)272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432